

Rezensionen – Comptes rendus – Reviews

Corff, Oliver et al. (eds.) (2013): *Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen. „Fünfsprachenspiegel“. Systematisch angeordneter Wortschatz auf Manjurisch, Tibetisch, Mongolisch, Turki und Chinesisch. Vollständige romanisierte und revidierte Ausgabe mit textkritischen Anmerkungen, deutschen Erläuterungen und Indizes.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 2 vols. liv, xii, 1110 pp., ISBN 978-3-447-06970-0

Reviewed by **Sven Osterkamp**, Sektion Sprache und Literatur Japans, Fakultät für Ostasienwissenschaften, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Universitätsstr. 134, 2.10, Bochum 44801, Germany, E-mail: sven.osterkamp@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

DOI 10.1515/asia-2016-0049

If asked for the closest East Asian equivalent to the series of polyglot dictionaries based on Ambrogio Calepino's initial *Dictionarivm* of 1502, what comes to one's mind first will undoubtedly be the original underlying the edition under review here: the late eighteenth century pentaglot (Manchu–Tibetan–Mongolian–Turki–Chinese) dictionary *Yuzhi wuti Qingwenjian* 御製五體清文鑑, the culmination of the well-known series of *Manju gisun-i buleku bithe*, or “mirrors of the Manchu language”, that started with a monolingual edition in 1708.¹ Admittedly, the comparison is somewhat weak – after all the pentaglot was never printed, unlike the mirror's mono- to tetraglot incarnations; in terms of different editions, even the series of mirrors in its entirety pales before the more than two hundred editions of Calepino's *Dictionarivm*; the maximum number of a

Article Note: The author would like to thank Gordian Schreiber (Bochum) and Mårten Söderblom Saarela (Berlin) for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this review article and its introduction respectively.

¹ The chief editions are as follows (giving only their Chinese titles, wherever one is indicated in the works themselves, otherwise resorting to their Manchu titles): 1708 (*Han-i araha Manju gisun-i buleku bithe*: Manchu only, 12,110 entries), 1717 (same title: Manchu–Mongolian, 12,110 entries), 1743 (*Han-i araha Manju Monggo gisun-i buleku bithe*: Manchu–Mongolian, but using the Manchu script for the latter, 12,110 entries), 1772 (*Yuzhi zengding Qingwenjian* 御製增訂清文鑑: Manchu–Chinese, 18,654 entries), 1780 (*Yuzhi Manzhu Menggu Hanzi sanhe qieyin Qingwenjian* 御製滿珠蒙古漢字三合切音清文鑑: Manchu–Mongolian–Chinese, 13,835 entries), late eighteenth century (*Yuzhi siti Qingwenjian* 御製四體清文鑑: Manchu–Tibetan–Mongolian–Chinese, 18,667 entries; also under the title *Siti hebi wenjian* 四體合璧文鑑, here arranged in Manchu–Mongolian–Tibetan–Chinese order), ditto (Manchu–Tibetan–Mongolian–Turki–Chinese, 18,671 entries). The numbers are taken from Kuribayashi Hitoshi 栗林均 (2008a): “Tagengo bunrui jiten *Gyosei gotai Shinbunkan*-no riyō-ni kansuru oboegaki” 多言語分類辞典『御製五體清文鑑』の利用に関する覚書 (Notes concerning the utilization of the polyglot classified dictionary *Yuzhi wuti Qingwenjian*). *Hokutō Ajia kenkyū* 北東アジア研究, extra number 1: 7–25, especially p. 8. There is also a privately printed Manchu–Chinese edition dating from 1735, entitled *Yinhan Qingwenjian* 音漢清文鑑.

“mere” five languages is less than half of the eleven languages found in the noted *Dictionarivm vndecim lingvarvm* (Basel 1590); the mirrors all follow a topical rather than pronunciation- or spelling-based arrangement; there is nothing here to correspond to the grammatical informaton provided for Latin, etc. Unlike some of the earlier editions, providing for instance definitions and explanations of meanings in Manchu, the pentaglot has more of a gigantic comparative wordlist (with 18.671 entries in total) than a dictionary as such. It is thus maybe somewhat reminiscent of the contemporary *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa* (St. Petersburg 1786/87, 1789) initiated by Catherine the Great – which needless to say however features fewer entries in lieu of a much wider scope in terms of languages, all of which are given only in the Cyrillic alphabet and thus not necessarily in original script.

Now, even if one concurs with the view that the pentaglot “is better understood as monumental literature than as a lexicographical aid”,² it is almost certainly the best-known and presumably also the most important polyglot dictionary of pre-modern East Asia.³ It seems difficult to overestimate the significance of the series of mirrors in the history of the lexicography of the languages concerned, as the mirror’s mono- to tetraglot editions – and since the twentieth century also the pentaglot edition – were to become the basis for a substantial number of lexicographic endeavors around the world, not all of which are necessarily centered on the Manchu language.

The significance of the mirrors as authoritative dictionaries of Manchu needs no further comment. We may only note that they also formed the basis for

2 Crossley, Pamela Kyle/Rawski, Evelyn S. (1993): “A Profile of the Manchu Language in Ch’ing History”. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 53.1: 63–102, here p.96.

3 We may note in passing that these later incarnations of the mirror were by far not the only polyglot dictionaries compiled in East Asia around 1800. Examples for such dictionaries typically follow a topical arrangement and never made it beyond the manuscript stage, much like the pentaglot.

In Korea, the end of the eighteenth century saw the compilation of Hong Myǒngbok’s 洪命福 (1733–?) *Pangŏn yusŏk* 方言類釋 (also known as *Pangŏn chipsŏk* 方言集釋; 1778, in *Pomanjæ inggan* 保晚齋剩簡 XXIV–XXV; Chinese–Korean–Manchu–Mongolian–Japanese) as well as Yi Ŭibong’s 李義鳳 (1733–1801) *Samhak yŏgŏ* 三學譯語 (1789, in *Kogŭm sŏngnim* 古今釋林 XXIX–XXXIV; Chinese–Korean–Mongolian–Manchu–Japanese).

For Japan see e. g. the *Yakushi chōtanwa* 譯詞長短話 (1796; covering Chinese, Tonkinese, Annamese, “Mughal language” [= Persian], etc.) by Gi Gozaemon 魏五左衛門 (1757–1834) or, several decades later, Takahashi Kageyasu’s 高橋景保 (1785–1829) *Aōgotei* 亞歐語鼎 (1823; Chinese[–Japanese]–Manchu–Dutch–Russian [the latter however often missing], rarely also English – for details on this work see the study referred to in note 8 below). Still later, Sakuma Shōzan 佐久間象山 (1811–1864) planned to compile a work covering the Manchu, “Indian”, French, Dutch and Russian “scripts” (apparently referring to the corresponding languages as well) and entitled *Kōkoku dōbunkan* 皇國同文鑑 in imitation of Chinese models including the *Qingwenjian*. The first printed polyglot of Japanese provenance is probably Murakami Hidetoshi’s 村上英俊 (1811–1890) *Gohō tsūgo* 五方通語 (1856; Japanese–French–English–Dutch–Latin).

alphabetically arranged works, especially the well-known *Qingwen huishu* 清文彙書 (1751) and the later *Qingwen buhui* 清文補彙 (1802), which takes the vocabulary of the 1772 edition into account. The series was however also of paramount importance for the compilation of further polyglot dictionaries, and especially for Mongolian lexicography. Among the earliest cases to be named here is the Manchu–Chinese–Mongolian *Sanhe bianlan* 三合便覽, which is content-wise closely related to the tetraglot. It carries a preface dated 1780 and written by Fujun 富俊 (1748–1834), who is also known as the compiler of the again related pentaglot dictionary *Menggu Tuote huiji* 蒙古托忒彙集 (1797, ms.). The five languages in this case are: Written Mongolian–Colloquial Mongolian–Written Oirat–Manchu–Chinese; note the position of Mongolian in the arrangement. The tetraglot later also formed the basis for a large number of bi- and trilingual dictionaries arranged according to Mongolian lemmata, starting with the Mongolian–Chinese–Manchu dictionary *Mengwen huishu* 蒙文彙書 (1851, ms.). This in turn laid the ground for the likewise trilingual *Qinding Mengwen huishu* 欽定蒙文彙書 (1891) and *Mengwen zonghui* 蒙文總彙 (1891; republished under the title *Meng-Han-Manwen sanhe* 蒙漢滿文三合 in 1913), with *Qinding Mengwen huishu* also bringing forth the later bilingual Mongolian–Chinese dictionaries *Menggu dacidian* 蒙古大辭典 (1912) and *Meng-Han zidian* 蒙漢字典 (1928). Another Mongolian–Chinese dictionary, entitled *Mengwen fenlei cidian* 蒙文分類辭典 (1926), is similarly said to be based on the tetraglot.⁴

In Chosŏn period Korea, the study of several foreign languages including Manchu and Mongolian was institutionalized at the Bureau of Interpreters (Sayŏgwŏn 司譯院). The mirrors' significance for the Bureau becomes most obvious in the late eighteenth century, when an adaptation of the 1772 edition was published under the title *Han-Ch'ŏngmun'gam* 漢清文鑑 (ca. 1779). Despite its title it is actually trilingual (Chinese–Korean–Manchu), at the same time reducing the amount of entries by about a quarter. There are, however, also various other hints as to the role the different incarnations of the mirror played for the study of both Manchu and Mongolian at the Bureau. The postface to the Manchu dictionary *Tongmun yuhae* 同文類解 (1748) mentions that lexicological sources such as an unspecified edition of the *Qingwenjian*, the *Daqing quanshu* 大清全書 (1683) and a work entitled *Tongwen guanghui* 同文廣彙 (most likely *Tongwen guanghui quanshu* 同文廣彙全書, 1693/1702) among others were relied on for its compilation. For Mongolian the mirrors' importance becomes apparent in the preface to

⁴ For details on the relationship of all these works see Kuribayashi Hitoshi 栗林均 (2012): “Kindai Mongorugo jiten-no seiritsu katei: *Shinbunkan-kara Mō-Kan jiten-e*” 近代モンゴル語辞典の成立過程——清文鑑から『蒙漢字典』へ (The development of modern dictionaries of Mongolian: From the *Qingwenjian* to the *Meng-Han zidian*). *Tōhoku Ajia kenkyū* 東北アジア研究 16: 127–147.

the trilogy of Mongolian studies used at the Sayōgwŏn, written on occasion of its reprinting in 1790,⁵ as well as from several entries in the *Daily Records of the Royal Secretariat* (*Sŭngjōngwŏn ilgi* 承政院日記).⁶

When the serious study of the Manchu language in Japan began shortly after the beginning of the nineteenth century, it was again the mirrors that occupied a central position for virtually all such endeavours. Thus e. g. Takahashi Kageyasu 高橋景保 (1785–1829) in Edo compiled about a dozen different works on Manchu since the late 1800s, drawing heavily upon the bilingual edition of 1772 for this.⁷ The same edition also served as the basis for the Manchu layer in his polyglot vocabulary *Aōgotei* 亞歐語鼎 (1823) as well as even for its entire classification scheme.⁸ Presumably at about the same time, the well-known poet and writer Ōta Nanpo 大田南畝 (1749–1823) included a brief description of the 1772 edition in his miscellany *Ichiwa ichigen* 一話一言, including a picture of it and quoting its preface in full. The bibliographical data of the same edition are also recorded in Edo-based publisher Matsuzawa Rōsen's 松澤老泉 (1769–1822) *Ikoku shomoku gaishū* 彙刻書目外集 (preface 1819, printed 1820; see I/53v). Later, in the 1850s, a group of Nagasaki-based interpreters of Chinese translated the 1772 edition including the Manchu definitions into Japanese (known as *Shinbunkan wage* 清文鑑和解, or *Hon'yaku Shinbunkan* 翻譯清文鑑) and also compiled an alphabetically arranged companion to it (*Hon'yaku Mango sanhen* 翻譯滿語纂編). Both projects

5 See “Monghak samsŏ chunggan sŏ” 蒙學三書重刊序, contained in the textbook *Ch'ŏphae mongŏ* 捷解蒙語 (1790 ed.). The other two works forming the trilogy together are the textbook *Mongŏ Nogŏltae* 蒙語老乞大 and the dictionary *Mongŏ yuhae* 蒙語類解.

The preface (2v–3r) mentions the acquisition of a *Mengwenjian* 蒙文鑑 in China in the previous year, i. e. 1789, which is furthermore said to date from Qianlong's reign and to provide the current pronunciation using the Manchu script. This can therefore only refer to the bilingual edition of 1743. On the identification of the *Mengwenjian* mentioned in the preface see already: Lee Ki-Moon [Yi Kimun] 李基文 (1967): “Monghaksŏ yŏn'gu-ŭi kibon munje” 蒙學書研究의 基本問題 (Fundamental problems in the study of the Korean materials for learning the Mongolian language). *Chindan hakpo* 震檀學報 31: 88–113, here p. 94.

6 See the entries dated 14.V.1737 (also cf. the *Yōngjo sillok* 英祖實錄 under the same date), 22.X.1764 (both referring to a *Qing-Mengwenjian* 清蒙文鑑, i. e. a bilingual Manchu–Mongolian edition) and 19.VII.1790. The *Daily Records* are conveniently available online at: <http://sjw.history.go.kr/>.

7 See e. g. Uehara Hisashi 上原久 (1963/64/65): “Takahashi Kageyasu-no Manshūgogaku” 高橋景保の満州語学 (The Manchu language studies of Takahashi Kageyasu), parts 1–3. *Saitama daigaku kiyō jinhun kagaku-hen* 埼玉大学紀要人文科学篇 11: 8–50/12: 1–34/13: 21–83.

8 That the entire classification scheme of *Aōgotei* follows the 1772 edition has already been pointed out by Sugimoto (1977: 4–5) in his detailed study of the former. See Sugimoto Tsutomu 杉本つとむ (1977): “Takahashi Kageyasu-hen *Aōgotei*-no shōsatsu: Edo jidai, Ajia-, Yōroppago taiyaku jiten” 高橋景保編「亞歐語鼎」の小察——江戸時代、アジア・ヨーロッパ語対訳辞典 (A study of the *Aōgotei* compiled by Takahashi Kageyasu: An Edo period dictionary of Asian and European languages). *Waseda daigaku toshokan kiyō* 早稲田大学図書館紀要 18: 1–12.

were however discontinued after several years.⁹ Almost a century later, when the first modern Manchu–Japanese dictionary appeared in the form of Haneda Tōru's 羽田亨 *Man-Wa jiten* 満和辭典 (1937), the major late eighteenth century incarnations of the mirror – for the first time now also including the pentaglot – again functioned as the chief sources together with the above-mentioned *Qingwen huishu*.

In Europe, the initial mirror was already known before its publication in 1708 owing to the Christian missionaries to China corresponding with Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716), who urged them to take part in the compilation of “le grand Dictionnaire Tartaro-Chinois” among other things to add “une traduction Européenne”.¹⁰ Indirectly – namely by way of the alphabetically arranged *Qingwen huishu* – it then served as the basis for the earliest dictionary of Manchu printed in Europe, Joseph-Marie Amiot's (1718–1793) *Dictionnaire tartare-mantchou françois* (Paris 1789–90).¹¹ In the following decades there was hardly anyone seriously engaged in Manchu language studies in Russia, France and elsewhere who did not rely on one or several of the mirrors, often leaving behind annotated and at least partially translated copies.¹² Unsurprisingly the mirrors were also fundamental in most of the later published dictionaries of

⁹ For a recent study including references to most of the relevant earlier literature see Matsuoka Yūta 松岡雄太 (2013): “*Hon'yaku Mango sanhen-to Shinbunkan wage-no hensan katei*” 『翻訳満語纂編』と『清文鑑和解』の編纂過程 (On the editing process of *Hon'yaku Mango sanhen* and *Shinbunkan wage*). *Nagasaki gaidai ronsō* 長崎外大論叢 17: 61–80.

¹⁰ Leibniz in a letter to French Jesuit Joachim Bouvet (1656–1730) dated 13.XII.1707. See no. 69 (here p. 598) in Widmaier, Rita (ed.) (2006): *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. Der Briefwechsel mit den Jesuiten in China (1689–1714)*. (Philosophische Bibliothek; 548). Hamburg: Felix Meiner.

¹¹ Contra Martin Gimm according to whose valuable introduction (“Die manjurischen Kaiser und die Fremdsprachen”, pp. ix–xiv; here p. xiii) Amiot compiled his *Dictionnaire* drawing upon the 1772 edition of the mirror. It goes without saying that Amiot's preference of the *Qingwen huishu* over the mirror was founded in the former's arrangement, for as he states in the “Avertissement de l'auteur” at the beginning of the first volume: “Le Dictionnaire universel [= the mirror] est d'un usage moins facile, parcequ'il est par ordre des matières ou par classes, et celui-ci [= the *Qingwen huishu*] par ordre alphabétique” (p. vj).

¹² For instance, Dorn (1846: 475–477) mentions a total of six exemplars of various mirrors in St. Petersburg alone from the collection of Paul Ludwig Schilling von Canstadt (1786–1837). These include two exemplars of what appears to be the 1772 edition, one “mit einer beige-schriebenen Russischen Uebersetzung des P. Hyakinth” and another one “mit beige-schriebener Russischen Uebersetzung des verst. Sipakow”. There is also another Manchu–Chinese–Russian dictionary “als Uebersetzung des Mandschuischen Wörterspiegels, von einem der Mitglieder der Russischen Mission, dessen Name unbekannt ist” as well as a manuscript of the 1735 edition “mit einer theilweisen Russischen Uebersetzung”.

Scholars such as Julius Klaproth (1783–1835) likewise possessed several printed and manuscript mirrors. The catalogue of his collection as sold after his death for instance included among others the 1772 edition (Deuxième Partie, no. 206) that had earlier been in the possession of Jean-Pierre Abel-Rémusat (1788–1832), the 1735 edition (no. 207) with added translations of the section titles into German as well as several manuscripts deriving from Johann Jährg (1747–1795) comprising a copy of the 1717 edition “traduits mot à mot en allemande” (no. 215). There is also an abundance of references to the different mirrors in the writings of Klaproth.

Manchu, including e. g. Zaxarov's, Hauer's and others. It is notable that they at the same time also formed an integral part of the study of Mongolian and Tibetan in Europe, especially since the early nineteenth century. For instance, Isaak Jakob Schmidt (1779–1847) acknowledges in the preface to his *Mongolisch-deutsch-russisches Wörterbuch* (St. Petersburg 1835) that a selection from the "Wörterspiegel" formed the basis for his collection of words, complemented by other sources. Together with two Tibetan-Mongolian dictionaries the tetraglot similarly formed the basis for Schmidt's *Tibetisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (St. Petersburg 1841), which influenced later dictionaries such as Heinrich August Jäschke's (1817–1883) *Handwörterbuch der Tibetischen Sprache* (Gnadau 1871) among others. Józef Kowalewski (1801–1878) likewise lists the tetraglot among the sources for his *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français* (Kazan 1844, 1846, 1849).

These haphazard and rather sketchy notes should be sufficient to illustrate how essential the various mirrors have been and continue to be for scholars in a number of different fields – and accordingly how great a desideratum a modern, reliable and convenient-to-use edition of the pentaglot has long been. This is especially true due to the fact that the pentaglot is content-wise extremely close not only to the tetraglot but also to the 1772 edition, so that scholars working on or with the latter dictionaries likely profit considerably from an edition of the pentaglot. The completion of the edition at hand is thus nothing less than a milestone in scholarship and an accomplishment we can hardly thank the editors enough for.

Speaking of the pentaglot itself, it has come down to us in (at least) three different manuscripts:

1. One formerly kept at the Chonghuaogong 重華宮 and later transferred to the Palace Museum. It was published in facsimile by Minzu chubanshe in 1957 (referred to in the edition as well as here as "PEK"). While it is thus easily available, it contains countless scribal errors and is often inferior to the other witnesses of the text.
2. Another one formerly kept at the Xiangfengge 翔鳳閣 in Shenyang that was discovered by Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 (1866–1934) and Haneda Tōru 羽田亨 (1882–1955), allegedly in 1912 (cf. pp. xxv, xxix). The photographs taken around this time later served as the basis for the reproduction of the pentaglot published by the Tōyō

See Dorn, Bernhard (1846): *Das Asiatische Museum der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St. Petersburg*. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften; Landresse, Ernest Augustin Xavier Clerc de (1839): *Catalogue des livres imprimés, des manuscrits et des ouvrages chinois, tartares, japonais, etc., composant la bibliothèque de feu M. Klaproth*. Paris: R. Merlin.

bunko 東洋文庫 (“TB”) in 1943.¹³ Now the dating of the “discovery” is undoubtedly an error, however, even if the same claim is also found elsewhere in the literature (e. g. in Imanishi 1966: 15, 28).¹⁴ It appears that the pentaglot was first introduced to the scholarly world by Haneda in 1913, at least if we only count specialized publications. Haneda himself, however, merely states that *the photographs were taken* in the preceding year, i. e. 1912.¹⁵ In fact, the pentaglot was already briefly introduced in at least two of Naitō Konan’s publications prior to 1912. In addition to the 1906 article already referred to by Walravens,¹⁶ Naitō published his *Photo Album of Manchuria* in 1908, which provides a photograph of the manuscript together with a brief explanatory note.¹⁷ According to the latter’s preface dated July 1906, all the photographs in the album were taken by Ōsato Buhachirō 大里武八郎 in 1905 – which is what then appears to be the actual date of the manuscript’s “discovery”. The brief description in the album states that it was kept at the Xiangfengge.

3. A third one in the possession of the British Library (“BL”), considered to represent the best text witness available (p. xviii).¹⁸ It is a matter of regret that only the first two out of the three known manuscripts are available in facsimile reproductions, whereas exactly the London manuscript has not yet been published in facsimile and does not appear to have been digitized either.

The basis for the present edition is PEK (p. xxxvii), but the editors assure us that “everything in PEK that seemed dubious in some way” was checked against BL and TB (p. xix).¹⁹ This is indeed highly advisable as Imanishi (1966: 161), for

13 At least two holding libraries in Japan have long digitized their copies and made them available online, namely the National Diet Library (see <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1139394>) and Waseda University Library (see http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/ho05/ho05_01928/index.html). As the resolution of the images is sometimes too low to make out all the details, they cannot however fully replace the underlying facsimile edition in its original form.

14 See Imanishi Shunjū 今西春秋 (1966): “*Gotai Shinbunkan kaidai*” 五體清文鑑解題/“The explanatory notes on *Wu-ti Ch’ing-wên-chien*, translated and explained. Edited by Tamura Jitsuzō 田村實造/Imanishi Shunjū 今西春秋/Satō Hisashi 佐藤長. 2 vols. Kyōto: Kyōto daigaku bungakubu, Nairiku Ajia kenkyūjo, 1966–1968, vol. 1, 1–16 (Japanese), 17–29 (English).

15 Haneda Tōru 羽田亨 (1913): “*Gotai Shinbunkan*” 五體清文鑑. *Geibun* 藝文 4.8. Reprinted in: *Haneda hakushi shigaku ronbunshū* 羽田博士史学論文集/*Recueil des œuvres posthumes de Tōru Haneda*, vol. 2. (Tōyōshi kenkyū sōkan 東洋史研究叢刊/Oriental Research Series; 3.2). Kyōto: Tōyōshi kenkyūkai, 1958, 445–453; here p. 445.

16 See p. 235, n. 3 in Walravens, Hartmut (2015): “*Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen [...]*”. *Central Asiatic Journal* 58.1/2: 234–238; or now also pp. 72–73, n. 3 in Walravens, Hartmut (2016): “Corff, Oliver [...] (Hg.): *Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch [...]*”. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 111.1: 72–74.

17 See no. 13 in Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 (1908): *Manshū shashin-chō* 滿洲寫真帖 (Photo album of Manchuria). Tōkyō: Tōyōdō.

18 “Die beste Textfassung hingegen bietet das Londoner Manuskript.”

19 “[...] wurden sämtliche Stellen des Pekinger Drucks, die in irgendeiner Weise fragwürdig waren, mit dem Londoner Manuskript und der Reproduktion des Fengtian-Manuskripts verglichen.”

instance, has long argued with reference to Manchu, that PEK with its frequent errors is much inferior to TB, which is also echoed by Kuribayashi (2008a: 10, 2008b: 31) for Mongolian.²⁰ Similar claims can be made for other layers of the pentaglot as preserved in PEK as well. The editors are well aware of the numerous problems PEK entails and likewise address several issues in the explanatory remarks (e. g. pp. xxviii, xxx, xxxvii).

Now a very simple entry in the pentaglot may look like the following example for ‘day’ (left and right here corresponding to the top and bottom in the original respectively):

1	2a	2b	2c	3	4a	4b	5
ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਤੀ, ਭੈਰਾ	ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਤੀ	ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਤੀ	ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਤੀ	ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਤੀ	ਕੁਮਾਰੀ	ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਤੀ	ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਤੀ

Every entry consists of eight elements covering five languages, arranged from top to bottom: 1) in the Manchu language and script; 2) in the Tibetan language both 2a) in its own script and 2b) in a transliteration as well as 2c) in a transcription into Manchu script; 3) in the Mongolian language and script; 4) in the Turki language, first 4a) in Arabic script as usual, followed by 4b) a transcription into Manchu script; lastly 5) in the Chinese language and script. On every single page of the original pentaglot we are thus dealing with five scripts with no less than four different orientations (i. e. vertical, left to right [Manchu, Mongol] and right to left [Chinese] versus horizontal, left to right [Tibetan] and right to left [Uighur]).

Out of the five languages three – i. e. Manchu, Mongolian and Chinese – are only given in its own script in the original pentaglot, whereas earlier editions sometimes also included transcriptions e. g. of Mongolian into Manchu script (1743, 1780 eds.), likewise of Chinese into Manchu script (1772 ed., *Siti hebi wenjian*) or into both the Manchu and Mongolian scripts (1780 ed.), or they even employed the Chinese script quasi-alphabetically to provide renderings of Manchu (1772 ed., also in the ms. of *Yuzhi jian Han Qingwenjian* 御製兼漢清文鑑) or both Manchu and Mongolian (1780 ed.).²¹

20 See Imanishi Shunjū 今西春秋 (1966): “*Shinbunkan*: Tantai-kara gotai-made” 清文鑑——単体から5体まで (On the *Qingwenjian*: From the mono- to the pentaglot edition). *Chōsen gakuho* 朝鮮学報 39/40: 368–410; Kuribayashi Hitoshi 栗林均 (2008b): “Mongorugo shiryō-to shite-no *Shinbunkan*” モンゴル語資料としての「清文鑑」 (The various *Qingwenjian* as sources on Mongolian). *Tōhoku Ajia kenkyū* 東北アジア研究 12: 1–34. For the bibliographic details of Kuribayashi (2008a) see note 1 above.

21 For instance, Manchū *yamjiha* ‘it turned evening’ is glossed as ⟨y̆.a.m̆.j̆.yi.h̆.ă⟩ 鴉阿穆齊伊哈阿 (1780 ed., I/3v), Mongolian *tengri* ‘heaven’ as ⟨t̆.ĕ.nğ.ğ.ĕ.l̆.ʔ̆.ĭ⟩ 特額斡歌額哩伊 (I/1v). Note however Kuribayashi’s (2008b: 26; see note 20 above) suggestion that the Chinese transcriptions of Mongolian are in fact not based on the latter language’s pronunciation as such, but rather on the Manchu transcriptions.

In the edition under review the entry given above now appears as follows (p. 34), together with the entry's unique number (0115.1) as well as highly useful indications as to where exactly the entry is located *in all three* different manuscripts:

① inenggi (tb) nyin. niyin nin (mo) edür øðøp (tu) kün kun 日 rì Tag

That is, all eight layers of the original are given here in unchanged order,²² exclusively using romanizations however with the exception of Chinese (which is conveniently given both in original script and Pinyin romanization). Anything else would certainly have led straight into a veritable typographical nightmare, even if we ignore technical problems for a moment; there can thus be little doubt that the editors' choice was a wise one. Together with the translations into modern Mongolian (in Cyrillic script) and into German – in a sense the “traduction Européenne” Leibniz desired – we now have an impressive total of eleven layers for every single one of the 18,671 entries in the pentaglot. No user of the edition will have difficulties imagining how Herculean a task the preparation of the manuscript for print must have been, even if we are dealing here with the combined efforts of almost a dozen scholars. Demanding perfection in every respect under such circumstances may easily be deemed unreasonable. This notwithstanding we would like to address two aspects in the remainder: the issue of romanization and the question as to what degree a collation of the three witnesses was actually carried out.

It goes without saying that for an edition in eleven layers, no less than eight of which are given in romanization, the consistent and transparent use of romanization schemes is of paramount importance. In the following we will concentrate on the romanization of the layers in Manchu script, specifically that of the rather sophisticated layer 2b, which arguably presents the greatest number of challenges to anyone attempting a transcription of the original manuscripts. The comparatively large variety of consonants in Tibetan necessitated an expanded inventory of letters in the Manchu script, while complex syllable structures with frequent consonant clusters yielded a number of graphotactical issues.

The Manchu script in use e. g. in the eighteenth century can be thought of as consisting of three sets of letters: a) a core inventory of letters necessary to write Manchu; b) a rather commonly employed expansion set used in conjunction with the core inventory that is necessary above all to allow for a

²² Contra Németh (2014: 416) who states that “In the edition, with reason, the content of the whole manuscript is transcribed, obviously, except for the Manchu transliteration of Tibetan and Turki.” See Németh, Michał (2014): “Remarks on the New Edition of *Wu ti Qing wen jian* (Ed. by Oliver Corff et al. 2013), or What Form Critical Editions of Lexicographical Manuscripts Should Take”. *Folia Orientalia* 51: 415–420.

more or less loss-free rendering of contemporary Mandarin in Manchu script; c) as well as a less commonly employed expansion (again, used in conjunction with the first two sets) used when writing languages other than Manchu and Mandarin, such as Sanskrit or Tibetan. While a) and b) are virtually always addressed together in accounts of the Manchu script, c) is frequently left unmentioned. Also, in terms of romanization the variation among current scholars observed for a) is often negligible, whereas there is quite a degree of disagreement in the case of b); for c) finally it is even no exaggeration to say that no standard exists at all.²³

With reference to the Manchu language in Manchu script the editors state that the romanizations follow Hauer (p. xliii), which obviously refers to Hauer's *Handwörterbuch*, the second edition of which was in a sense a byproduct of the pentaglot edition.²⁴ However, as c) was largely irrelevant for Hauer's dictionary, his romanization can only serve as a model for a) and b). Also, as a matter of fact the present edition does not necessarily follow Hauer for b) either. For instance, the letter ʈ (used e. g. to transcribe the Chinese initial corresponding to Pinyin *z* and Tibetan *dz* ཨ) is romanized as *dz* here, whereas Hauer generally has *z* (see e. g. Hauer 2007: 534–535).²⁵ A further deviation from Hauer and in addition a source for inconsistencies is the combination of this letter with what appears to be a variant shape of *yodh* in final position.²⁶ This combination corresponds to Pinyin *zi* as in *shizi* 世子 'heir apparent of a prince of the first rank', *zhangzi* 長子 'heir apparent of a prince of the second rank' or *taizi* 太子 'crown prince' for instance, and is written *ze* by Hauer (2007: 446, 275, 458): *šize*, *jangze*, *taize*. In the edition under review, however, it is rendered as either *dz* or *dzi*, which is neither in accordance with Hauer – even if for very good reasons in the case

23 For a most useful overview of graphemes belonging to c) together with a proposal concerning the romanization of the full inventory of graphemes in the Manchu script see Kam Tak-sing 甘德星 (2000): "Manwen luomazi pinxiefu chuyi" 满文罗马字拼写法刍议 (On the romanization of the Manchu script). *Manxue yanjiu* 满学研究 6: 50–68 as well as Kam Tak-sing (2010): "'Manwen luomazi pinxiefu chuyi' buji" 「满文羅馬字拼寫法芻議」補記 (Supplementary notes to 'On the romanization of the Manchu script'). In: *Manxue: lishi yu xianzhuang*: guoji xueshu yantaohui zhaiyaoji "满学: 历史与现状" 国际学术研讨会摘要集, 21–28.

Also see Stary, Giovanni (2004): "An Unknown Chapter in the History of Manchu Writing: The 'Indian Letters' (*tianzhu zi* 天竺字)". *Central Asiatic Journal* 48.2: 280–291 as well as pp. 20–23 in Stary, Giovanni (2006): *Vom Alphabet zur Kunst. Illustrierte Geschichte der mandschurischen Schrift*. (Aetas Manjurica; 12). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

24 Hauer, Erich (2007): *Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache. 2., durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage herausgegeben von Oliver Corff*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

25 Note that *z* is used as well in the edition's romanization of the Manchu script, but for a special letter belonging to c), used to write Tibetan *z* ཨ for instance – on which see below.

26 See Nakamura Masayuki 中村雅之 (2008): "Kangoon *zi*, *ci*, *si*-o arawasu Manshū moji" 漢語音「*zi/ci/si*」を表す満洲文字 (On the Manchu letters rendering Chinese *zi*, *ci* and *si*). *KOTO-NOHA* 65: 1–4, here especially pp. 2–3.

of *dzi*²⁷ – nor is this done consistently within as well as in between different layers. Consider the following entries containing the words given above as examples:²⁸

entry	1	2a	2b	2c
0255.1	šidz [!]	shi-tsi	ši ts	šidzi [!]
0255.3	jangdz [!]	cang-tsi	c'ang ts	jangdzi [!]
0278.1	taidzi [!] taiši	tha'i-rtsi-tha'i-shi	tai ts/rts ²⁹ tai ši	taidz [!] taiši

In Manchu script 1 and 2c are entirely the same in all three cases, yet the editors vary in their romanizations, using sometimes *dz* but also sometimes *dzi*, both in 1 and 2c: *šidz(i)* (Hauer's *šize*) for ᡩᠠᡳᡵᡳ, *jangdz(i)* (*jangze*) for ᡩᠠᡳᡵᡳ, *taidz(i)* (*taize*) for ᡩᠠᡳᡵᡳ.

The aspirated counterpart of *dz* (Hauer's *z*) ʈ, namely ʈ̥ (used e. g. to transcribe the Chinese initial corresponding to Pinyin *c* and Tibetan *tsh* ʈ̥), similarly deviates from Hauer's *z'* and is written *tsh* here. Again, for the combination ʈ̥/ (corresponding to Pinyin *ci*) he would use *e* and thus write *z'e* (see e. g. Hauer 2007: 535), whereas the edition has *tshy* instead (see e. g. 2c of 1070.3).³⁰ It is only natural then that ʈ̥/ is written *sy* here, abandoning Hauer's *se*, again – even if left unmentioned – for good reasons.³¹

²⁷ First, the letter in final position appears to be a variant shape of yodh (whereas the regular final yodh does not seem to co-occur with the consonant letter *dz* [Hauer's *z*]), so that rendering it as *dzi* appears appropriate. More importantly however, using *dzi* here allows us to distinguish it from actual *dze* ʈ̥/ (corresponding to Pinyin *ze*), which Hauer's (and others') use of *e* does not. Also cf. note 31 below.

²⁸ Note that for reasons of typographical consistency the edition's 'ᡩ' is replaced with 'ᡩ' here throughout.

²⁹ "ts/rts" is a correction by the editors, based on *rtsi* ᡩᡳᡵᡳ as in PEK's 2a. Note however that TB (III/14v) has *tsi* ᡩᡳᡵᡳ here instead, so that 2a–c all match. Regrettably the edition does not comment on the textual variation observed between PEK and TB in this and a number of other cases – we will come back to this issue below.

³⁰ Hauer's *z'e* suffers from the same problem as his *ze* (on which see note 28 above), as the distinction between ʈ̥/ versus ʈ̥/ (corresponding to Pinyin *ce* and *ci* respectively) is lost in his romanization. That both end up as *z'e* is also obvious from the following entry in Hauer (2007: 535): "z'e chin. 策, 詞 usw." In Manchu script *ce* 策 and *ci* 詞 are however distinguished as ʈ̥/ and ʈ̥/ respectively.

³¹ Writing *se* for ʈ̥/ in contradistinction to *se* for ʈ̥/ is misleading, as it suggests that the difference between the two lies in their initial consonant rather than the following vowel. Graphically, final ʈ̥/ and medial ʈ̥+ may well be derived from *e* (i. e. final ʈ̥/ and medial ʈ̥+), as suggested by Imanishi (1959: 64) and Nakamura (2008: 3; cf. note 27 above) for instance. Also, Nakamura's romanization of this as *ě* rather than *y* has the advantage of avoiding any possible confusion with *y*.

See Imanishi Shunjū 今西春秋 (1959): "Mango tokushu jibo-no nisan-ni tsuite: sono rōmajihō-no mondai" 満語特殊字母の二三について——そのローマ字法の問題 (On several special letters for the Manchu language: The problem of their romanization). *Tōhōgaku kiyō* 東方学紀要 1: 53–66.

Next are the modified versions of the letters *c* and *j* which predominantly appear in the combinations *ʃ* and *ʒ* (corresponding to Pinyin *chi* and *zhi* respectively). These would be *cʼi* and *jʼi* according to Hauer (e. g. 2007: 86, 297), whereas here it is difficult to establish regular correspondences: Hauer’s *jʼi* is sometimes indeed found as *jʼi*, notably in the Manchu transcriptions of Turki (see e. g. 4b of 0616.2, 0692.1 or 0796.1 for cases in both initial and medial position), but also elsewhere (see e. g. 2c of 0742.2). It also appears as *ji* in accordance with Möllendorf and others, however, sometimes even side by side with *jʼi* in the same lemma (compare e. g. 1 with 4b of 0692.1). Also see 2b of 0677.4 and its again different romanization *jʰ* for *ʃ* in PEK – which incidentally is merely an error for TB’s (VI/60r) *ʃ* (on which see further below). In this light, Hauer’s *cʼi* might be expected to be written as *cʼi* or possibly *cy* (or *cʼy*, as Möllendorf does) or even *cʰi*, but for reasons unknown it is repeatedly found as *či* in the Manchu renderings of Turki,³² and even as *cyi* instead in renderings of Tibetan, as in the examples below. Note that there is no additional yodh to be found in the original spellings as suggested by the addition of *i*.

entry	2a	2b	2c
0038.1	'khrigs-pa	^h k'riḡs p'a	cyikba [!]
0064.4	khug-rna-'khrigs	kuḡ rna ^h k'riḡs	kuk na cyik [!]
0253.3	khri-thub	k'ri tub	cyitob [!] ³³

Finally, while Hauer (e. g. 2007: 297) has *ʃ* for *ʃ* (corresponding to Pinyin *r*-), the edition prefers *ž*, reserving *ʃ* for a different letter (see below). Apart from adopting Hauer’s *kʼ*, *gʼ* and possibly *hʼ* for the set *ʃ*, *ʒ* and *ʒ* the edition thus has little in common with his romanization beyond the core inventory. This notwithstanding no outline of the romanization of the Manchu script is provided by the editors, not even for the the expansion set b) to the core inventory. A number of their decisions therefore regrettably remain rather intransparent to the user.

Now layer 2b goes beyond the core inventory and also beyond the expanded inventory used to transcribe Chinese, making use of several further additions in order to allow the Tibetan entries to be transliterated truthfully to their original orthography, keeping all distinctions intact. As hinted at above there are several competing proposals but certainly no standard in terms of a romanization covering everything from a) over b) to c). As the editors have despite these circumstances decided to give only a very incomplete account of the romanization scheme

³² See e. g. 4b of 0573.2, 0574.3, 0576.3, 0577.2–4, 0578.1–4, 0579.1, 0579.3–4, 0581.2, 4454.3 etc.
³³ Note that *-tob* in PEK is an obvious error for *-tub* as found in TB (III/2r). Again, however, the textual variation is left uncommented and the error left uncorrected in the edition.

used as well as of the actual Manchu script behind it, even users acquainted with Manchu in general will likely face some difficulties in using the edition under review for layer 2b. At least in the beginning constant comparison with a facsimile of at least one text witness of the pentaglot will be necessary here. In this respect the older Japanese edition of the pentaglot (simply referred to as *Yakkai* in the following) with its comprehensive tables showing all Manchu letters and other symbols together with their respective romanizations as found in the main body of the edition fares considerably better than the present one, even if it suffers from its own serious deficiencies.³⁴ Limiting ourselves to the simple consonants in prevocalic position³⁵ and ignoring consonant clusters, vowels other than *a* (and *e* for the velars) as well as comparatively rare special symbols here,³⁶ we get approximately the following picture for the transliterations of Tibetan in layer 2b. Renderings peculiar to c) are indicated by a gray background; where different the romanizations as found in *Yakkai* are given in square brackets for comparison.³⁷

ka	ᠠᠭ	kha	ᠬᠠ	ga	ᠭᠠ	nga	ᠩᠭᠠ
g'a (ge)	ᠭᠠ	k'a (ke)	ᠬᠠ	ga (ge)	ᠭᠠ	ng'a	ᠩᠭᠠ ³⁸
[ḡa (ge)]		[k'a (ke)]				[ṅa]	

³⁴ See note 14 for bibliographic details of the Japanese edition and pp. xviii–xix therein for the tables.

³⁵ A noteworthy Tibetan consonant cluster not covered by the table is *lh-* as in *lha* ᠯᠬᠠ which is transliterated into Manchu script as the usual *l* plus diacritical circle, romanized in the edition as *l'*.

The variety in possible postvocalic consonants is limited so that the correspondences here are relatively straightforward. Note however that Tibetan *-d* and *-g* are always transliterated as *-t* and *-k*; unlike prevocalic *ng-*, postvocalic *-ng* is rendered by the usual *-ng* ᠩᠭ.

³⁶ For a comparatively rare (in the pentaglot at least) and apparently likewise unexplained (but admittedly rather self-explanatory) symbol see e. g. 0720.3: Here, Tibetan *wam-she* in 2a is transliterated as °*wa še* in 2b, with ° for *anusvāra* ṣ (on which also see Kam 2010: 26; see note 23 for bibliographic details). Further examples for ° are found in 0721.4, 0722.1 etc. As the editors' footnotes indicate, BL has *anunāsika* ṣ instead in all three cases, transcribed in the edition as °) which again is hardly in need of an explanation.

³⁷ Another, however incomplete romanization scheme of the Manchu transliterations of Tibetan in the pentaglot is provided by Haenisch in his edition of a fragment. Apart from *d'* and *p'* there is little overlap with the romanization scheme in the edition under review; the renderings of most other special letters are etymographically based, imitating the use of circles as diacritical marks in the Manchu script: ᠠ, ᠨ, ᠰ, ᠱ, ᠵ (= *l'*, *ng'*, *z*, *zh*, *ts* in the new edition). Initial ^h is equated with *e* by Haenisch (e. g. 1953: 7, no. 3 [= 4398.3]), which is readily explained by the graphical proximity of the two due to scribal errors in many instances.

See p. 13 in Haenisch, Erich (1953): *Zur japanischen Phototypieausgabe des fünfsprachigen Wörterspiegels*. (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung; Veröffentlichung 16). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

³⁸ Being derived from *n* (initial ᠨ, medial ᠨ ~ ᠨ) by replacing the diacritical dot with a circle, *ng'* shows exactly the same variation in shape (initial ᠩ, medial ᠩ).

ca	ཅ	cha	ཆ	ja	ཇ	nya	ཉ
c'iya [jiya]	ཉྩྨྩ	ciya	ཉྩྨྩ	jiya	ཉྩྨྩ	niya	ཉྩྨྩ
ta	ཏ	tha	ཐ	da	ཏ	na	ཏ
d'a [ḍa]	ཏྩྨྩ ³⁹	ta	ཏྩྨྩ	da	ཏྩྨྩ	na	ཏྩྨྩ
pa	པ	pha	ཕ	ba	པ	ma	པ
p'a [ḥa]	པྩྨྩ	pa	པྩྨྩ	ba	པྩྨྩ	ma	པྩྨྩ
tša	ཅ	tsha	ཆ	dza	ཇ		
tša [ḍṣa]	ཅྩྨྩ	tsha [ts'a]	ཅྩྨྩ	dza	ཅྩྨྩ		
wa	མ	zha	མ	za	མ	'a	མ
wa	མྩྨྩ	zha [ṣa]	མྩྨྩ	za [ṣa]	མྩྨྩ	^h a [ḥa]	མྩྨྩ
ya	ཡ	ra	ར	la	ལ		
ya	ཡྩྨྩ	ra	ཡྩྨྩ	la	ཡྩྨྩ		
sha	ཤ	sa	ས	ha	ཧ	a	ཨ
ṣa	ཤྩྨྩ	sa	ཤྩྨྩ	ha	ཤྩྨྩ	a	ཤྩྨྩ

The correspondences are generally close to the table of Manchu renderings of Tibetan provided in *Qinding Tongwen yuntong* 欽定同文韻統 (1750; III/4r–6r). The editors already point this out as well (p. xxxiv), but pass over the details, including the differences between the two. Thus, where *Tongwen yuntong* (III/5v) gives *ṣa* ^h with initial *ṣ* (Hauer's *ṣ*) ^h to render Tibetan *zha* ^h, the pentaglot prefers *zh* ^h, created on the basis of *ṣ* ^h in a fashion entirely parallel to deriving *z* ^h from *s* ^h. (In 2b *ṣ* does not seem to occur at all as a regular correspondence, at best in the case of scribal errors; cf. below.)



The comparison between the pentaglot and *Tongwen yuntong* suffers from the circumstance that the latter only gives Manchu renderings of *Ca*-type syllables, so that the correspondences for syllables featuring other vowels than *a* are not necessarily clear. This is an especially vexing problem for letters restricted to combinations with a specific class of vowels. For instance, Tibetan *ka* yields *g'a* in Manchu script, but *g'* only combines with *a* and *o*. Thus, while *ka* and *ko* can be (and are) transliterated unambiguously as *g'a* and *g'o* respectively, *ge*, *gu*

³⁹ As with the common *t* and *d*, *d'* has a variant shape with a longer stroke to the left depending on the following vowel.

etc. have to be used for non-existing **g'e*, **g'u* etc. This is problematic in so far as Manchu *g* also already corresponds to Tibetan *g*, so that e. g. *ge* in 2b can render both Tibetan *ke* and *ge* (cf. e. g. 0180.3 with 0120.3 etc.). With a view on the transliteration scheme in its entirety, however, such problems with overlapping correspondences are the exception, not the rule – especially when the many scribal errors in PEK are eliminated by textual criticism. Overall, the system is rather straightforward once users of the edition have figured out themselves how exactly the romanizations of Manchu script work here – with the notable exception of Tibetan *c* and its reflexes.

According to *Tongwen yuntong*, Tibetan *c* should be rendered by a special letter (initial ɿ, medial ɿ̄) modelled upon *j* (initial ɿ, medial ɿ̄) with an addition to the right of the spine. Whereas *Yakkai* (p. xix) correctly groups the two letter forms together as allographs of the same grapheme transcribed as *ǰ*, the editors of the edition under review apparently split them into two separate ones, transcribed entirely differently: *c'(i...)* (not to be confused with Hauer's *c'i*) in initial, but *ǰ(i...)* in medial position. (In the following we will use *ǰ* to refer to both allographs together where necessary.) Additionally, the medial shape of ɿ̄ is often written rather flatly, resulting in something difficult to distinguish from the medial shape of *ǰ* + (which, to make the chaos perfect, would be *ǰ* in Hauer's romanization).

Now, Manchu *ǰ* is supposed to be used for Tibetan *zh* in the system outlined in *Tongwen yuntong*, not for *c*, to which *ǰ* corresponds. It seems unlikely (and it is in any case entirely unnecessary to assume) that Tibetan *c* is transliterated differently depending on its position, initial versus medial, so that we are inclined to consider instances of *ǰ* in 2b for *c* in 2a in the edition as errors for *ǰ* throughout.⁴⁰ Such a conclusion seems even more inevitable if we compare cases of alleged *ǰ* and *ǰ* with their models in PEK. For instance, entry 0308.2, 2b given below is deemed to feature both *ǰ* and *ǰ* in directly adjacent syllables – despite an appearance in the facsimile that hardly supports a clear-cut graphical distinction. TB (III/30r) clearly confirms *ǰ* in both syllables as well. Furthermore, the same letter used to transcribe *c* in the same Tibetan syllable *gcig* is romanized with *ǰ* in 0308.2 but with *ǰ* in 0124.2 for instance.

entry	2a	2b	
0308.2	[...] -bcu-gcig	[...] bǰiyu gǰik	
0124.2	[...] -gcig	[...] gǰik	

⁴⁰ It appears that Haenisch (1953: 9, no. 38 [= 4407.3] etc.) likewise misinterpreted *ǰ* as *ǰ* (his *ǰ*) in his edition.

Further such problems with the alleged opposition between *ṣ* and *ṣ̣* for Tibetan *c* are not difficult to find, thus calling into question its validity. To sum up: it seems that the letter *ṣ* appears in three distinct romanizations in the edition, namely as *c'* (initially), as *j* (medially) as well as erroneously as *ṣ̣* (likewise medially) for what are intended to be instances of *ṣ*. While *ṣ̣* for actual *ṣ̣* (and for what unmistakably looks like *ṣ̣* even if we should expect *j* in its place) should needless to say be retained, *j* alone seems sufficient for the remainder. (Note also the confusing use of the same romanization *ṣ̣* in 2c of 1415.3 for what is a scribal contamination of intended *dz* + [cf. the expected rendering in TB XI/45r] with *ṣ̣* – which resembles neither of the two other letters romanized as *ṣ̣*.)

A similar case with (at least) four different romanizations for the same letter is that of *ṣ̣* (i. e. *j* plus diacritical circle), used to render Tibetan *ṭ* in accordance with *Tongwen yuntong*. In the romanized Manchu transliterations of Tibetan in 2b, we find *c°* (e. g. 0742.2) and *c'°* (e. g. 0600.3, 0709.2), but also *ṣ̣°* (1904.3; cf. the case of *j* vs. *ṣ̣* above) – whereas 2c of the same entry 1904.3 has *j'*. Such inconsistencies are prone to puzzle the user on a regular basis.

Given the above, let us dwell upon the aspect of textual criticism for a bit, as it is also crucial for the case of Tibetan *c*. Browsing through the edition under review and comparing its critical text with PEK and TB (unfortunately not of BL as well, as it was unavailable to the reviewer) one rather commonly notices that – notwithstanding an already very substantial number of errors and corrections the editors do comment upon – even obvious mismatches between 2a, 2b and 2c or other equally obvious errors are still left entirely uncommented and uncorrected, despite the fact that TB (and presumably also BL) more often than not confirms what one would expect under the assumption that layers 2b and 2c were executed in a more or less systematic fashion.⁴¹

Following the system of transliterating Tibetan as stipulated in *Tongwen yuntong* and also as observable in the pentaglot, a syllable such as Tibetan *chu* should yield Manchu *ciyu* ᠴᡢᡵᡠ in a regular fashion. Yet, in PEK's layer 2b some of the correspondences may appear to be almost at random, so that *chu* is in fact frequently rendered as ᠴᡢᡵᡠ (not ᠴᡢᡵᡠ), given in the edition as *ciui*.⁴² First, this again deviates from Hauer's romanization which has *-ioi* throughout for

⁴¹ Particularly puzzling but apparently less frequent are cases involving a *partial* correction of PEK based on TB, such as 1427.2: While the unexpected *po* in 2b for *phu* in 2a is corrected into *pu* as it is found in TB (cf. n. 1 to 1427.2), *ṣ̣ziyuḳ* for *'jug* in the same entry is left unchanged and commented – despite the fact that the correspondence is irregular as well and that TB (XI/51v) has the expected *ṣ̣jiyuḳ* after all.

⁴² From p. xxxiv, where a distinction is made between *ṣ̣jiuḳ* versus *ṣ̣jiuḳ* – presumably with *iu* for yodh–waw without dot (Hauer's *io*) versus *iḳ* for yodh–waw with dot –, we may possibly infer that ᠴᡢᡵᡠ would rather be romanized as *ciui* by the editors. In absence of a gapless explanation of the Manchu romanization scheme used in the edition this is somewhat speculative however.

orthographic yodh–waw–yodh (with dotless waw),⁴³ even if the actual pronunciation is probably indeed better approximated by *-iui*.⁴⁴ Second, these cases apparently involve serious scribal errors throughout. This is already suggested by the transliterational system as such, as long as we assume it to be more or less consistent, but is also confirmed by the dozens of instances where TB has the expected and completely regular correspondence, i. e. *ciyu*. Still, while the editors claim to have checked everything in PEK that seemed dubious in some way against the other witnesses, in numerous instances no reference to either TB or BL and no correction is made.⁴⁵ This is however not an issue pertaining to specific syllables or syllable types alone. The following is a random selection of cases with various errors in PEK that were left uncommented in the edition and might easily have been rectified through consultation of TB.

entry	2a	2b	2c	comments
0015.2	zla-'od-skya	zla ^h od sg'ya	da ot ya [!]	TB (I/8r) <i>da ot ja</i>
0017.1	gser-phur-	gser pur	sirpur [!]	TB (I/9r) <i>serpur</i>
0028.4	gre	gre	ye [!]	TB (I/14v) <i>je</i>
0055.3–4	ser-bas- [...]	ser bas [...]	serwei [!] [...]	TB (I/28v) <i>serwai</i>
0076.2	shing-	šing	šeng [!]	TB (II/2r) <i>šing</i>
0077.2	shing-pho	šing po	šengpo [!]	TB (II/2v) <i>šingpo</i>
0503.1–2	sker-'tham(-res)	sger ^h am (res)	girtam(rei) [!]	TB (V/47r) <i>gertam(rei)</i>
0507.1	phan-tshun-brdeg	pan tshun brdek	pratshundek [!]	TB (V/49r) <i>pantshudek</i> [!]
1433.3	rgyab-byed	rgyab byed	jabyet [!]	TB (XI/54v) <i>jabjet</i>
1437.3	gces-par-byed	gziyes p'ar byed	jai [!] barjet [!]	TB (XI/56v) <i>jei barjet</i> (PEK actually has <i>barajet</i>)
1438.1	sbyin-pa	sbyin p'a	jimb [!]	TB (XI/57r) <i>jinba</i>

At times we may even speak of clusters of errors which could have been avoided without much effort. Consider for instance the following set of four immediately adjacent entries:

⁴³ Note incidentally that the same string of letters in *Manchu words* is romanized as *-ioi* in accordance with Hauer, at least in entries such as 0692.4, 0693.1, 0693.3, 0694.3, 0695.3 etc. Similarly, where Hauer has *-iong*, the edition has both *-iung* and *-iong*, at times even in the same lemma. For one such case see e. g. 0096.2, in which according to the edition Tibetan *cung* is equated with *c'iung* (i. e. *jiung* ལུང – TB II/12r incidentally has the expected *jyung* once more) in 2b versus *jiung* ལུང in 2c.

⁴⁴ See e. g. the Manchu–Chinese syllabary entitled *Jianxie sanhe hanzi shier zitou* 兼寫三合漢字十二字頭 contained in the 1772 edition which for instance transcribes *nioi* (used e. g. for Chinese *nü* 女) as *ni-wu-yi* 尼烏衣, *hioi* (e. g. for *xu* 虛) as *xi-wu-yi* 希烏衣 etc. with *wu* 烏 for Manchu *u* (not *e* 鄂 for *o*). This is likewise reflected in the Korean renderings of such syllables, see e. g. *Han-Ch'ongmun'gam* I/6r with its *nyuy* ㄴ유 and *hyuy* ㅎ유 for *nioi* and *hioi* respectively.

⁴⁵ For a selection of such cases see e. g. 0079.2–3, 0197.1–3, 0199.3–4, 0200.1–4, 0201.1–2, 0201.4, 0202.3, 0206.1–4, 0207.1–4, 0208.1–4, 0209.1–4 etc.

entry	2a	2b	2c
1436.1	snying-rje-can	sniying rrye [!] jiyān [!]	ningje jiyān [!]
1436.2	snying-rje-byed	sniying rrye [!] byed	ningje jet
1436.3	snying-rje-byed-'jug	sniying rrye/rjiye byed ^h žiyuḳ/ ^h jīyuḳ	ningje jetjuk
1436.4	snying-re-byed [!]	sniying re ržiye [!]	ningje [!] jet [!]

Looking at PEK and the edition alone one may wonder why the clearly erroneous *rrye* is corrected only in 1436.3 but not in the two preceding entries. Assuming the transliteration to be systematic, one would expect all three cases of *rrye* as well as the single case of *ržiye* in 1436.4 to have *rjiye* instead. If we now turn to TB (XI/56r) for comparison we find that *all four instances* are indeed clearly given here as *rjiye* just as 2b of 1436.3 ends in the expected ^h*jīyuḳ* here – yet none of this is indicated in the edition.

Next, all four entries have *ningje* in 2c (note however that 2c of 1436.3 is missing in PEK and was supplied from BL in the edition), which however makes little sense in the case of 1436.4. Again, some error appears to have found its way into PEK – and again TB would have provided the editors with an opportunity for correcting it, as here we clearly read *ningre je*. This brings us to the third syllable in 2c of 1436.4, which is allegedly *jet* in PEK. In fact however, both PEK and TB merely have *je* rather than *jet*. If 2c has *je*, the correspondence with *ržiye* (which as stated above is an error for *rjiye* as it is found in TB) starts to make sense after all, but what then about *byed* in *snying-re-byed*? This appears to be yet another scribal mistake, based on the two preceding entries whose third syllable is indeed *byed*. This assumption is confirmed by TB which has *snying-re-rje*, so that 2a–2c are after all in perfect accordance with each other. For a similar case of disagreement between the three Tibetan layers see e. g. 0291.2: While 2a has *ngang-bzang-man*, both 2b and 2c give the third syllable as *ma* – which the editors emend to “ma/man” in 2b (however, for reasons unknown not in 2c) to agree with 2a. Now TB (III/21r) – and likewise *Siti hebi wenjian* (III/58v) – has *ngang-bzang-ma* in 2a, however, which explains both of the Manchu renderings.

The last irregularity to be noted in the set 1436.1–4 concerns the reflexes of Tibetan *can* which is of special interest to us as the diversity of Manchu transliterations for this syllable is given on p. xliii as one of the reasons why a table summarizing the correspondences between the Tibetan and Manchu scripts as seen in the transliterations could not easily be provided. According to the edition, *can* in 2a of 1436.1 is allegedly both transliterated and transcribed into Manchu script as *jiyan*. The latter is an error in the edition, as both PEK and TB have the expected *jan* rather than *jiyan* in 2c. However, *jiyan* in 2b is now indeed what PEK gives, but once more we are dealing with an error here, namely for *jīyan* (the editors' *c'īyan*, i. e. ᠵᠢᠶᠠᠨ) as found in TB. Checking a random sample of cases

involving *can* in 2a transliterated as *jiyan* in 2b in PEK against the corresponding entries in TB shows that this must be an extremely common error.⁴⁶

Given that *jiyan* is the less marked of the two and that the graphical difference between the two is minimal, it is easy to imagine the difficulties scribes had depending on their level of acquaintance with Tibetan and its transliteration into Manchu script.⁴⁷

To stay with Tibetan *can* for a little longer: According to the editors (p. xliii) PEK gives no less than eight different transliterations for it, namely “*c’iyan, ji-yan, giyan, zriyan, ciyan, syan, rian, ryan*” (note that *jiyan* and *žiyān*, which we also find in the main text of the edition, are absent here). The first two – likely the most common variants – have already been dealt with sufficiently. Next, *giyan, rian* and *syān* are apparently exceedingly rare clerical errors in 2b: For *giyan* see e. g. 1150.1, appearing as expected as *jiyan* in TB (X/3r). Confusion between *g* and *ḡ* is not too uncommon in PEK: Tibetan *lcags* is mis-transliterated as *lgiyaks* (1154.3; TB X/5r: *lḡiyaks*), *bcu* as *bgiru* (1162.4; TB X/9r: *bḡiyu*), *lcām* as *lgiyam* (1224.3; TB X/41r: *lḡiyam*), *lcibs* as *lgibs* (1272.2; TB X/66r: *lḡibs*) etc. Similarly common is the confusion of *gi* and *j*: see e. g. the numerous instances of Tibetan *’jug* transcribed as *juḡ* in 2c in TB, but as *giok* in PEK,⁴⁸ or likewise in 1201.4 *giyo* for Tibetan *jo* rather than *jiyo* as in TB (X/29r). — The few cases for “*syān/jiyan*” the reviewer noticed are 3252.2, 3252.4 (TB XXIV/8v: *jiyan* for the latter and probably also for the former) and 3282.4 (TB XXIV/23v: *jiyan*). In fact two out of these (3252.4, 3282.4) hardly resemble *syān* at all even in PEK, whereas 3252.2 indeed does. — The only case for *rian* the reviewer has spotted is 3259.1 with “*rian/jiyan*” (possibly the medial shape of *ḡ* overwritten with [the left half of] its initial shape?) for which TB (XXIV/12r) has the expected *jiyan*. — The other spellings mentioned by the editors, namely *ciyan, zriyan, ryan* (note the graphic proximity to *rian*) appear to be rare misspellings as well, at least the reviewer was so far unable to find any instances at all. It is regrettable that the editors decided not to give any references for such rare cases. — For a case of *žiyān* in the edition see e. g. 3258.4, which once again can be corrected into *jiyan* based on TB (XXIV/11v). There is thus something

⁴⁶ For examples see e. g. 1400.1, 1403.4, 1405.1, 1406.1, 1417.1, 1417.3, 1420.2, 1433.1, 1434.3, 1436.1, 1438.3, 1441.4, 1442.1–2, 1444.1, 1447.3, 2492.2–4, 2493.1, 2493.4 etc. In all of these cases PEK has incorrect *jiyan* whereas TB gives the correct form *jiyan* (or *c’iyan*), which is indicated in not a single instance in the edition under review.

⁴⁷ This is not to say of course that correct renderings do not occur at all in PEK. See e. g. 1652.2 for 2b *c’iyan* for 2a *can*. Also, errors in the opposite direction occur as well (though apparently much less often). For instance, instead of *žiyān* for *’jam* (1399.1), *ḡiyuḡ* for *’jug* (1400.4) or *žiyok* for *’jog* (1426.2–3, 1427.4) we should expect transliterations with *j* throughout: *ḡjiyam, ḡjiyuḡ, ḡjiyok* (as found in TB again).

⁴⁸ See e. g. 0483.2, 0483.4, 0484.4, 0485.4, 0486.2, 0487.4, 0488.1, 503.3, 0505.2 etc.

fundamentally wrong with PEK, which all the more calls for a careful collation of the several witnesses.

Apart from a lack of gapless textual criticism making full use of the other witnesses besides PEK, there is a second apparently non-negligible source of errors we can identify: The preface seems to suggest that the Manchu renderings of Tibetan were not input manually from scratch but rather that a rough draft version of them was generated automatically from a romanized version of 2a with the help of an algorithm (p.xvii).⁴⁹

Such an approach might then well explain a number of oddities observed in 2b. For instance, Manchu generally has only *-t* ʈ in coda position, but no *-d*. Thus, whereas initial Tibetan *d*- corresponds to Manchu *d*-, the same *-d* as a coda could only be transcribed as *-t*, both in 2b and 2c. Nevertheless, the edition romanizes the same letter as *-t* only in 2c, but as *-d* in 2b – presumably based on the romanization of Tibetan. The difference in Manchu spelling suggested in the edition’s romanizations simply does not exist, which is likewise true of the frequent *-ḳ* in 2b vs. *-k* in 2c. Consider the following examples:

entry	2a	2b	2c
1344.1	srod-long	srod [!] long	sorot long
1346.3	mig-hur	miḳ hūr	mik [!] hūr

Moreover, the automatic generation of 2b from 2a may also explain most if not all of the cases where the edition suggests that 2b (and sometimes 2c) is entirely regular in its correspondence with 2a, even if in PEK 2b (or 2c) actually deviates from 2a. Consider e. g. the following cases:

entry	2a	2b	2c	comments
0486.4	bgros[!]-thogs- 'jug	bgros [!] toks ʰjiyuḳ	juitokgiok [!]	2a: TB (V/38v) 'gros 2b: PEK & TB ʰgros 2c: PEK juitokkiok, TB joitokjuḳ
0501.1	'khrugs-'dzing-	ʰk'ruḳs ʰdzing	cokdzing [!]	2c: PEK cokdzeng, TB (V/46r) cuḳdzeng

49 The original wording is: “Auf der Grundlage dieses Datenmaterials [= romanized Tibetan in 2a] entstanden die Algorithmen zur automatischen Erzeugung der Rohfassungen der manjurischen Umschriften des Tibetischen.” It is unclear whether the plural “Umschriften” refers to 2b and 2c together or merely e. g. to the entirety of 2b for instance.

1418.1	'tsho-rten-yod	^h tsho rd'en [!]	yod	tshoden jot	2b: PEK <i>rd'an</i> , TB (XI/46v) <i>rd'en</i>
1421.4	las-byed	las byed		laijet [!]	2c: PEK <i>laijat</i> , TB (XI/48r) <i>laijet</i>
1430.4	bag-phebs	bak pebs [!]		bakpab [!]	2b: PEK <i>pabs</i> , TB (XI/53r) <i>pebs</i> 2c: TB <i>bakpeb</i>
1447.4	'dzin[!]-bag	^h dzin [!]	bak	dzimbak [!]	2a: TB (XI/62r) <i>'dzem-bag</i> 2b: PEK & TB <i>^hdzem bak</i> 2c: PEK & TB <i>dzembak</i>

Entry 1447.4 is of special interest, as here not a single of the three layers of Tibetan is in accordance with PEK. Final *-n* in *^hdzin* in 2b is presumably based on 2a and merely another victim of the algorithm; PEK (as well as TB) consistently has *-m* in 2a to 2c. The same is true for the vowel of the first syllable: in both 2b and 2c the Manchu rendering clearly has *e* rather than *i* – which raises the question why Tibetan *i* is given as *e* here. PEK indeed appears to have *'dzim* (but clearly not *'dzin*), although the vowel diacritic is somewhat odd in shape. This is likely not coincidental but related to the fact that this is an error anyways, whereas TB has the expected *'dzem* – so that 2b and 2c make perfect sense as well.

Finally there are also errors in the edition that are either mere typos or may also stem from misreadings or misinterpretations of what is present in PEK, sometimes but not necessarily paired with errors that are already found in PEK. Examples for this include the following:

entry	2a	2b	2c	comments
0252.4	bdag-po	bdak p'o	datboo [!]	2c: PEK & TB (III/1v) <i>dakboo</i>
0274.1	bsgo-yig	bsgo yiḳ	gonik [!]	2c: PEK & TB (III/12v) <i>go'iḳ</i>
0446.2	'dzin-yig	^h dzin yiḳ	dzei'k [!]	2c: PEK & TB (V/17v) <i>dzen'iḳ</i>
0744.1	'bul-yig	^h bul yiḳ	bulaik [!]	2c: PEK & TB (VII/30v) <i>bul'iḳ</i>
1100.3	'khyog-snye	^h k'yok sniye	coknia [!]	2c: PEK <i>cokniya</i> , TB (IX/53v) <i>cokniye</i>
1418.1–2	[...]-yod	[...] yod	[...] jot [!]	2c: PEK & TB (XI/46v) <i>yot</i>
1447.2	tshul-gtsang	tshul gdzang/ gtsang	tshuldzan [!]	2c: PEK & TB (XI/62r) <i>tshuldzang</i>
4929.2	[...]-gcig	[...] g,riḳ [!]	[...]jik	2b: PEK & TB (bIV/66v) <i>g'iḳ</i>

The case of 0274.1 requires some comment: In view of 2a and 2b, the form *gonik* in 2c is not only already phonetically dubious with its intervocalic *n*. The romanization *gonik* also suggests གའོཁིག, whereas neither PEK nor TB has the dot to the left necessary to yield *n*. Instead both clearly have གའོཁིག, i. e. with a dot-less aleph in between waw and yodh, which following Stary's suggestion should

be romanized as *go'ik*.⁵⁰ (Which in fact the editors actually did in other cases, in varying positions however.)⁵¹ The aleph here is not an incomplete *n* but merely indicates a syllable boundary, or hiatus,⁵² i. e. here in contradistinction to རྩོམ་ with its tautosyllabic concatenation of waw and yodh which yields *gûk* instead. *Yakkai* (no. 1044) has “goaik” instead, which is slightly better – if seen in isolation, aleph might render *a* of course – but still off. If the aleph in question indeed rendered *a* here, we should expect a double rather than single yodh for the following *i*. The same misinterpretation of ' as *a* is incidentally also found in the edition under review, one example of which is given above (see 0744.1).

In passing we may also note various other but always marginal errors, the existence of which is neither surprising for an edition as voluminous and complex as the present one, nor in the end of any serious harm to the user. These include some inconsistencies in the treatment of Chinese,⁵³ a

50 See Stary, Giovanni (1999): “Manchu Names and Some Problems Concerning their Transcription”. *Studia Orientalia* 87: 245–251, here especially pp. 249–250.

Similar examples are easily found in Manchu transcriptions of foreign languages other than Tibetan. See e. g. *fili'i* for Latin *fili* in the phrase *in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti* (Bibliothèque Nationale, Mandchou 249: 35) or *ewanggeli'um* for Latin *evangelium* in *enduringge ewanggeli'um* ‘holy gospel’ in Lipovtsov’s translation of the New Testament etc.

51 For a hiatus marked in the expected linear position, see for instance “šui'ik” in 2c of 0743.3. Quite frequently, however, in the romanization the apostrophe follows the vowel the additional aleph actually precedes in the original Manchu. Thus we find e. g. “jiyari'k”, “giuti'k”, “giyai'k”, “temi'k”, “cai'k”, “mai'k” and “ciu'cung” in 2c of 0447.1, 0447.4, 0730.3, 0734.2, 0746.3, 0747.4 and 1931.2 for what one might expect to read *jiyar'ik*, *giut'ik* (i. e. *giot'ik*), *giya'ik*, *tem'ik*, *ca'ik*, *ma'ik* and *ci'ucung* respectively. Now in n. 2 to 1931.2 the editors even note with reference to “ciu'cung” in PEK (which is incidentally written the same in TB XIV/49r): “Mit zusätzlichem ‘Zahn’ zwischen ‘i’ und ‘u’ geschrieben.” Maybe *u'* for instance is thus not meant to be read as two separate letters but with the apostrophe modifying the preceding vowel letter, maybe in the sense of “the vowel *u* but preceded by an unexpected aleph”? In any case, Stary’s suggestion with its apostrophe in the expected linear position seems preferable.

52 Hence also its name “Mongolian Sibe syllable boundary marker” in Unicode where it is encoded as U+1807.

53 For instance: Tone marks are generally provided, but sometimes also conflicting ones (cf. e. g. “gāo lǐ rén” in 1148.3 versus “Gāoli(rén)” in n. 6 to the same entry) or they are omitted (sometimes partially as e. g. “shì rén jiā de” in 2572.4 versus “shì rén jie [!] de” in n. 3 to the same entry versus “shì rén jia [!] de” in 2573.1; sometimes entirely as in “Evtl. von 鑰匙 *yaoshi*.” in 3400, n. 1). Especially in the German translations Chinese words and names are at times only given in Pinyin but not in original script; also small capitals or italics are sometimes used for the romanization, sometimes not (compare e. g. “倉頡 *Cang Jie*” in 4623.3 with “CANG JIE” in 4624.1, or “Han-Zeit” in 4628.3 with “HAN-Zeit” in 4630.4). Sometimes the romanizations are preceded by spaces, suggesting that the corresponding Chinese characters were supposed to be inserted later on (see e. g. “von *Lu*” in 4626.2).

number of footnotes whose meaning is rather elusive,⁵⁴ as well as other minor issues.

In addition to the two-volume edition under review as such a set of five index volumes, one for each language, has been published in 2014, which will undoubtedly facilitate future work on and with the pentaglot and related dictionaries. Even without these additional indices, the edition at hand is already a lasting monument of scholarship on what in turn is itself a monument of pre-modern polyglot lexicography. It has received the highest praise by other reviewers and rightly so – for one cannot but recommend it strongly. For users interested in the perhaps less central layers such as 2b, it is at the same time difficult however to second Németh's (2014: 415; see note 22) words who considers the edition to be “the *finest possible* edition of this monumental lexicographical manuscript” (reviewer's italics). In the light of the above one is forced to modify this wording slightly, even if we hasten to add that there are no indications that the other layers not addressed here in any detail suffer from the same or similar shortcomings.

The issues concerning the romanization of the Manchu script hinted at above in the end remind us of the pressing need to finally establish a romanization scheme taking into account the *full inventory* of the script – and thus a scheme that will eventually provide scholars with the means to deal in a consistent fashion with texts as demanding as Manchu transcriptions of *dhāraṇī* or the pentaglot for instance.

⁵⁴ For instance, n. 1 to 4288.3 merely says “;??”, n. 1 to 4365.3 reads like a comment addressed to one of the editors (“Stimmt das in dieser Umgebung?”), n. 1 to 4270.4 switches to English for no apparent reason (“see ui. 4268.2”), and so on.